



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/235,084	01/21/1999	ALAN WALBECK	INTELOG.003A	5205

20995 7590 09/05/2002

KNOBBE MARTENS OLSON & BEAR LLP
2040 MAIN STREET
FOURTEENTH FLOOR
IRVINE, CA 91614

EXAMINER

DINH, KHANH Q

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2155

DATE MAILED: 09/05/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.
09/235,084

Applicant(s)
Walbeck et al

Examiner
Khanh Dinh

Art Unit
2155



-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE THREE MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136 (a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on Jun 13, 2002.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-16 and 19-33 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above, claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-16 and 19-33 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claims _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
*See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). _____ 6) ☐ Other:

Art Unit: 2155

DETAILED ACTION

1. This is in response to the Remarks filed on 6/13/2002. Claims 1-16 and 19-33 are presented for examination.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless --

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

3. Claims 1-7, 9, 10, 13, 14, 19-25, 27, 28 and 31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being clearly anticipated by Norin et al US pat. No.5,787,247.

As to claim 1, Norin discloses an internal node (34 fig.2) database comprising information about nodes on a network (see abstract, figs.1, 2, col.8 line 30 to col.9 line 65 and col.12 line 5 to col.13 line 56), a software module (i.e., using monitoring functions, col.15 line 11 to col.16 line 57) configured to provide an active mode and a standby mode, said active mode configured to maintain a said internal node database and to provide access to said node database, said standby mode configured to maintain said internal node database as a mirror copy (i.e., replicated resource) of an external node database (also see col.13 line 18 to col.15 line 60).

Art Unit: 2155

As to claims 2, Norin discloses internal node database further comprising rules that specify actions to be taken upon a state change of a client node (see col.17 line 7 to col.19 line 65 and col.20 line 21 to col.23 line 63).

As to claims 3 and 4, Norin discloses rules are simple and complex rules (see col.17 line 7 to col.19 line 65 and col.20 line 21 to col.23 line 63).

As to claims 5-7, Norin discloses a rules engine configured to interpret rules, shims configured to translate rules into a rule definition language and a change in an instance variable of the client node (see col.17 line 7 to col.19 line 65 and col.24 line 1 to col.26 line 27).

As to claims 9 and 10, Norin discloses transitioning to said active mode when an unacknowledged client request is detected and configured to tunnel a first protocol through a second protocol (see col.13 line 18 to col.14 line 60, col.17 line 7 to col.19 line 65 and col.20 line 21 to col.23 line 63).

As to claim 13 and 14, Norin discloses an event handler configured to notify a user application when a change occurs in an instance variable of said client node (see col.13 line 18 to col.14 line 60, col.17 line 7 to col.19 line 65 and col.20 line 21 to col.23 line 63).

Art Unit: 2155

As to claim 16, Norin discloses user interface is configured to allow a user to control nodes on a power line network (see col.13 line 18 to col.14 line 60, col.17 line 7 to col.19 line 65 and col.20 line 21 to col.23 line 63).

As to claim 19, Norin discloses:

creating a node database containing information about said nodes (see abstract, figs.1, 2, col.8 line 30 to col.9 line 65 and col.12 line 5 to col.13 line 56), designating an active gateway node to maintain said node database, said active gateway node providing one or more access methods to access said node database (i.e., using monitoring functions, col.15 line 11 to col.16 line 57), and mirroring said node database in one or more standby server nodes (i.e., replicate resource, see col.13 line 18 to col.15 line 60).

Claim 20, 21 are rejected for the same reasons set forth in claims 2 and 5 respectively.

As to claims 22 and 23, Norin discloses generating event notifications when said state change occurs provided to a dispatcher (see fig.2, col.13 line 18 to col.14 line 60, col.17 line 7 to col.19 line 65 and col.20 line 21 to col.23 line 63).

Claims 24 and 25 are rejected for the same reasons set forth in claims 6 and 7 respectively.

Art Unit: 2155

As to claim 27, Norin discloses activating one of said standby server nodes after said active server becomes inactive (see col.13 line 18 to col.14 line 60, col.17 line 7 to col.19 line 65 and col.20 line 21 to col.23 line 63).

As to claim 28, Norin discloses encapsulating raw packets in a first protocol into wrapper packets in said desired protocol and tunneling said raw packets through said desired protocol (see col.13 line 18 to col.14 line 60, col.17 line 7 to col.19 line 65 and col.20 line 21 to col.23 line 63).

Claim 31 is rejected for the same reasons set forth in claim 13.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 8, 11, 12, 15, 26, 29, 30, 32 and 33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Norin et al., US pat. No.5,787,247.

As to claims 8, 11, 12, 15 and 33, Norin's teachings still applied as in item 3 above. Norin does not specifically disclose the use of ping requests, power line protocol, PLX protocol and an

Art Unit: 2155

Internet browser. However, the use of such protocol and interface is generally well-known in the art. It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to implement well-known teachings into the system of Norin to process and control data processing systems because it would have controlled data processing systems more quickly.

Claim 26 is rejected for the same reasons set forth in claim 8. As to the added limitation, Norin discloses listening for responses to said requests, said responses used to update said node database (see col.13 line 18 to col.14 line 60, col.17 line 7 to col.19 line 65 and col.20 line 21 to col.23 line 63).

Claims 29, 30 and 32 are rejected for the same reasons set forth in claims 11, 12, 15 respectively.

Response to Arguments

6. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-16 and 19-33 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

7. Claims 1-16 and 19-33 are rejected.


Art Unit: 2155

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Khanh Dinh whose telephone number is (703) 308-8528. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 8:00 A.m. to 4:00 P.m.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ayaz R. Sheikh, can be reached on (703) 305-9648. The fax phone number for this group is (703) 305-7201.

A shortened statutory period for reply is set to expire THREE months from the mailing date of this communication. Failure to respond within the period for response will cause the application to become abandoned (35 U.S.C. Sect.133). Extensions of time may be obtained under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(A).

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305 -9600.


AYAZ SHEIKH
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100

Khanh Dinh
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 2155
08/22/2002